

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 31 2007

Remarks:

Reconsideration of the application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

) Claims 14, 16, 17, and 20 - 33 are presently pending in the application. Claims 14 and 20 have been amended. Claims 1 - 13, 15, and 18 - 19 have been canceled. New claims 27 - 33 have been added.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that item 8 of the above-identified Office Action indicated that claims 19 - 21 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such, Applicant has amended independent claim 14 to include all of the limitations of former claims 18 and 19 (now canceled). Thus, independent claim 14 now corresponds to the prior claim 19, and is believed to be in condition for allowance for the same reasons. Similarly, Applicants' claim 20 has been amended to include all of the limitations of former claims 14 and 18, from which claim 20 depended. Thus, Applicants' independent claim 20 is additionally believed to be in condition for allowance. The remaining claims depend, ultimately, from either the allowable claim 14 or the allowable claim 20, and thus are additionally believed to be in condition for allowance.

)

Applic. No. 10/649,602  
Response Dated May 31, 2007  
Responsive to Office Action of March 2, 2007

In item 2 of the Office Action, claims 14, 16, 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0191263 to Hoang et al ("**HOANG**").

In item 3 of the Office Action, claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **HUANG** in view of Yano et al (IEEE September 1990). In item 4 of the Office Action, claims 15 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **HUANG** in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,111,156 to Hachiuma. In item 5 of the Office Action, claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **HUANG** in view of Maxim (Spec Sheet, January 2002). In item 6 of the Office Action, claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **HUANG** in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,034,424 to Fujimura et al ("**FUJIMURA**"). In item 3 of the Office Action, claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over **HUANG** in view of **FUJIMURA**, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,862,322 to Ewen et al.

Applicant believes that the above rejections are moot, in view of the amendments to claims 14 and 20.

Applic. No. 10/649,602  
Response Dated May 31, 2007  
Responsive to Office Action of March 2, 2007

It is accordingly believed that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, teach or suggest the features of claims 14 and 20. Claims 14 and 20 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claims 14 or 20.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 14, 16, 17 and 20 - 33 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

05-31-07 15:57 FROM-

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
MAY 31 2007

T-308 P12/12 U-311

Applic. No. 10/649,602  
Response Dated May 31, 2007  
Responsive to Office Action of March 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant

Kerry P. Sisselman  
Reg. No. 37,237

May 31, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Steiner LLP  
Post Office Box 2480  
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480  
Tel: (954) 925-1100  
Fax: (954) 925-1101